

File No. P-17024/7/2019-RC (FMS-369625)

Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development
Rural Connectivity (RC) Division

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi


Dated the 31st July, 2020

MINUTES

Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III, submitted by the State Government of Gujarat for the 2020-21 (Batch-II)-reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on 24th July, 2020 at 10:30 AM under the Chairpersonship of Additional Secretary (RD) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Gujarat under PMGSY-III for the year 2020-21 (Batch-II).

2. It is requested that a compliance report on all the observations of the Committee may be sent to Ministry/NRIDA.


(Anurag Bhatnagar)

Assistant Commissioner (RC)

Tel: 011-23382406

Distribution:-

1. The Secretary, Roads & Building Department, Gandhinagar -382010, Gujarat.
2. The Chief Executive Officer, GSRRDA and CE (P) & Addl. Secretary, Road & Bridge Department, Gandhinagar- 382010.Gujarat.
3. All Directors, NRIDA.

Copy for information to:-

PPS to Secretary (RD)/PPS to AS & FA/PPS to AS (RD)/ PPS to JS (RC) New Delhi

Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee held on 24th July, 2020 to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Gujrat under

PMGSY-III, Batch-II (2020-21)

1. A meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee for PMGSY was held on 24.07.20 through Video Conferencing under the Chairpersonship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Gujarat under PMGSY-III, Batch-II, 2020-21. Following officers from the Ministry, NRIDA and State Government of Gujarat participated in the VC.

Smt. AlkaUpadhyaya	Addl. Secretary (RD) & DG NRIDA
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel,	Joint Secretary (RC), MoRD
Devinder Kumar	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri. B C Pradhan	Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri. Pradeep Agrawal	Director (PI), NRIDA
Shri Kailash Bisht	Dy Dir (F&A), NRIDA
Shri Harsh Nisar	Data Scientist, NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri SB Vasava	Secretary (R&B)
Shri. KK Patel	Chief Engineer (Panchayat) & Addl Sec & CEO, GSRRDA
Shri TP Goswami	Dy EE
Shri SG Sojawala	AE
Shri. DharaKalsaria	AE (ITNO)
Shri. JH Mali	AE
Shri. Parth M Jani	Finance Executive

2. **Current Proposal of the State Govt. under PMGSY-III, Batch-II of 2020-21**

Item	As per State's proposal dated 20.07.2020				As per OMMAS dated 21.07.2020			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)
Roads	173	1728.34	1054.28	60.99	155	1,568.77	987.70	62.96
Total	173	1728.34	1054.28	60.99	155	1,568.77	987.70	62.96

A presentation on the proposal submitted by the State was made by NRIDA before the Pre- Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

MoRD Share: Rs. 579.21 Crores

State Share: Rs. 408.48 Crores

State Target for PMGSY III: 3012.50 km

Sanctioned: 1299.88 km

STA has scrutinized 115 roads of 1164.56 km, however PTA scrutiny of at least 10% of the proposals are yet to be done. The state was advised to complete the PTA scrutiny before the EC

(i) **Carriageway width wise and Average cost wise details of road:** Roads of 41.77 km length are 3.75 m width with an average cost of Rs 57.41 lakhs/km, 151 roads of 1527.00 km are 5.50 m wide with an average cost of Rs. 63.11 lakhs/km.

(ii) **Length wise details of road:** Except one road all proposed are more than 5 km.

(iii) **Traffic wise details of road:** In 3.75 m carriageway width, 04 roads of 41.77 km are in T5 category with average cost Rs 57.11 lakhs/km. In 5.50 m carriageway width, 55 roads of 521.13 km are in less than T5 category with average cost Rs. 63.92 lakhs/km, 88 roads of length 914.51 km with average cost Rs. 63.41 lakhs/km are in T6, T7 & T8 category and 08 roads of length 91.35 km with average cost Rs 55.51 lakhs/km are in T9 category.

Average cost of 5.50 m road having T5 traffic is more than average cost of 5.50 m width road with T9 traffic. State should examine and explain the reasons behind higher average cost for lower traffic category road.

(iv) **District wise details of current proposals** *There is substantial increase in average cost of road in some districts like Junagarh, Gandhinagar, Anand, Aravali, Amreli, Baruch, Sabarkantha, Narmada, Morbi, Kutch and Mahisagar as compared to the cost of recently sanctioned Batch-I of Gujrat. State should give the detailed justification why there is steep rise in the average cost in these districts.*

3. DPR Issues

Following DPR issues were presented for consideration before Pre EC. The Pre EC observations on these issues, if any are also mentioned below: -

(I). State needs to provide Hon'ble MP's consent letter as per Ministry's advisory dated 02.06.2020 along with MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats duly signed by the competent authority.

(ii) In maximum DPRs existing roads have good surface based on photographs attached and widening proposed with granular overlay in most of the roads (e.g. GJ2111, GJ0305, GJ1712). *State to again verify and upload fresh photographs with detailed justification as to why RQI has not been proposed for such roads.*

(iii) Average cost per KM is higher when compared to previous batch. State brought out that some roads are in hilly areas. *Detailed justification is required for higher cost. Cost is much higher in some districts from the previous batch proposals. This needs justification.*

(iv) 3rd party traffic survey or axle load survey details needs to be provided wherever roads proposed more than 1 MSA, as per guidelines (27 roads). State should forward the same before EC.

(v) Design stage Road Safety Audit details needs to be provided for the roads proposed more than 5 KM length. State should forward the same before EC.

(vi) Maximum of roads proposed are with less than 1 MSA, which may not qualify for 5.5 m carriageway based on PCU considerations. Max roads are T5 Category, therefore, state should review and propose 3.75 metre carriageway width for these roads.

(vii) State needs to ensure that the required land width is available to provide 9 m top width. In maximum DPRs 7.5m road width has been considered for 5.5 m carriageway width roads. Further, State should ensure that the existing CDs are widened to 9 m width. Detailed justification for replacement of CD and widening of roads is required from state with regard to traffic.

(viii) BM layer is provided in approx. all the DPRs while as per IRC: SP: 72:2015, provision of BM layer should be given only for Traffic more than 1.5 MSA. State should review the same and for roads with traffic less than 1.5 MSA. BC, seal coat should be considered as per relevant provisions of IRC.

(ix) Overlay thickness over existing BT layer should be proposed as per Clause 2.2.3 of IRC: SP:72:2015.

(xi) Existing Sub-grade CBR reported as 3 to 4 and Fly Ash and Lime stabilization has been proposed for its improvement. However, there is no damage seen in existing pavement and shoulders as per attached photographs. Soil tests needs to be verified at STA laboratory on a sample basis (GJ0307). *State to verify CBR from STA Lab.*

(xii) Width of GSB layer and WMM layer for intermediate lane, should be restricted to 5.80 m & 5.50 m respectively.

(xiii) Quantity for profile correction is given in BM layer. Profile correction shall be carried out in WBM/WMM.

(xiv) Cost of CD is on higher side (Rs 20 lakhs/km) and needs to be justified. (GJ1606, GJ0505, GJ3007, GJ2112, GJ2112, GJ1507). Detailed justification is required from state.

(xv) Majority of the pipe culverts are proposed for replacement and as per photographs only maintenance is required. State needs to propose widening instead of complete removal. Detailed justification is required for replacement along with photographs.

(xvi) Protection works need to be justified with X section drawings and clear coloured photographs (GJ3007). State should provide detailed justification.

(xvii) Cost of road furniture is on the higher side (Rs 4.58 lakh/km- GJ3310). Higher provisions made for signboard (294 nos) and CATS eye for Rs 12.23 lakhs. *State should propose it after doing road safety audit only at required places as per guidelines.*

(xviii) Utility shifting charge need to be provided from the State share.

(xix) As per IRC:119 Metal Beam Crash barrier required only on bridge approach and embankment height more than 3m. *State should provide these only at vulnerable portions.*

4. Planning Related Issues

- (i) Profile layer correction is to be considered only in WMM/WBM layer, not in BM.
- (ii) For traffic below T5 category replacement of all CD culverts not required.
- (iii) In District Valsad, block Umbergram for link route T01 alignment and DPR length not matching.
- (iv) In District Jamnagar, Block Jamjodhpur, proposed length is 21 KM but actual GIS length is 9.6 KM. State to reconcile.
- (v) Banaskatha and Mehsana have proposed roads with very good condition. However, during VC it was brought out by SRDA that erroneously they have shown only good roads. State to reexamine the same.

(vi) State should explore new technology for construction of roads in water logged areas for reduction in cost.

(vii) Soil testing should be done wherever soil stabilization is required.

5. **Trace Map Ranking** 99 % of proposal are in top 50% ranking.

Trace Map Rank	Number of Proposals	%
1-15	99	86.1
16-50	16	13.9
50-100	0	0
100+	0	0

6. Status of Marketing Reforms

Out of 9 reforms, State has completed 7 reforms. State should comply with rest of the reforms such as unified single market at State level and declaring waterhouse/cold storage, as deemed market before sanctioning of the proposals.

7. Maintenance

Item	Value in Lakhs	% w.r.t Const. Cost.
5 years Maintenance	6,428.13	6.51%
6 th year renewal cost	20,889.77	21.15%

The State has also not included 5 years' maintenance cost after 6th year renewal and the same needs to be included in the DPR.

8. Maintenance –Financial (As reported by state)

State has spent Rs 96.62 crore (77%) as against the requirement of Rs 125.61 crore over the last 7 years on roads under DLP. However, during FY 2020-21, expenditure incurred on DLP roads is only 1.12 crore which is very less. Overall Unsatisfactory % based on NQM inspections on roads under DLP during the last 2 years is 20.59% which is quite large.

Year (s)	Amount required as per Contract	Amount Credited in account of SRRDA	Amount Utilized by SRRDA	% Expenditure w.r.t maintenance funds Required	Unsatisfactory % based on NQM inspections (Under DLP)		
					Total Nos.	“U” Nos.	U %
2014-15	13.66	26.40	7.49	54.83%	21	2	9.52%
2015-16	16.53	0.00	10.40	62.92%	66	1	1.52%
2016-17	21.38	18.00	51.92	242.84%	22	7	31.82%
2017-18	33.86	19.00	13.14	38.81%	26	1	3.85%
2018-19	24.50	19.00	6.15	25.10%	29	8	27.59%

2019-20	11.05	20.00	6.40	57.92%	34	7	20.59%
2020-21 (as on date)	4.63	0.00	1.12	24.19%	0	0	0.00%
Total:	125.61	102.4	96.62	76.92%	198	26	13.13%

9. **e-Marg Status** e-Marg onboarding should be completed soon as this module will be used for monitoring of maintenance under PMGSY III.

PROGRESS ON PACKAGES	Total Workable Packages	52
	Locked Packages	2
	No. of Packages where payment is made	0
	Payment made (Lakhs)	0
CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION STATUS	Total No. of contractors	37
	Total No. of contractors registered	6

10. R&D technology

The State has proposed 47 roads/stretchers of 401.55 KM with Waste Plastic, Fly ash in embankments, lime stabilization and Nano Technology. The State needs to propose more length using Waste Plastics (About 60 Km) and IRC Accredited Technology at least 5%.

11. Quality Control

Out of 30 No of packages no field lab found in 02 packages. For maintenance work unsatisfactory grading is more than 20 %. State needs to take action for improvement

12. The State was asked to furnish the compliance report on the observations of the Pre-Empowered Committee urgently so that the proposal could be placed before the Empowered Committee at the earliest possible.

Meeting ended with Vote of Thanks to and from the Chair.
